DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 216 433 EA 014 605

AUTHOR Adkison, Judith A.
TITLE Advocates and Administrators: Perspectives on the Title IX Coordinator's Role.
SPONS AGENCY Women's Educational Equity Act Program (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 51p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, March 19-23, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Characteristics; *Administrator Role; Affirmative Action; Case Studies; Civil Rights; *Compliance (Legal); Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; Federal Regulation; Role Perception; *Sex Fairness
IDENTIFIERS Title IX Education Amendments 1972

ABSTRACT

The role perceptions and activities of seven individuals responsible for coordination of the efforts of their respective districts to comply with the requirements of Title IX of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act are described in this research report. All seven districts involved in the study complied at least with the letter of the law. Six went beyond compliance on paper to compliance in fact, and four beyond formal compliance to positive action embodying the spirit of equality. Researchers found that conditions identified by previous studies as necessary to successful fulfillment of the role of Title IX coordinator were not in fact present in all cases where coordinators proved effective. In each instance it was the particular interrelationship of district and coordinator characteristics, rather than the specific characteristics themselves, that appeared vital to coordinator effectiveness. (Author/PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Judith Adkison

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED216433

ADVOCATES AND ADMINISTRATORS: PERSPECTIVES ON THE TITLE IX COORDINATOR'S ROLE

Judith A. Adkison

The University of Kansas

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, 1982.

This report was produced under a grant from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Education, under the auspices of the Women's Educational Equity Act. However, the opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the position or the policy of the Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

EA 014 605

ADVOCATES AND ADMINISTRATORS: PERSPECTIVES ON THE TITLE IX COORDINATOR'S ROLE

Introduction

The implementing regulations for Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 require local institutions to establish an administrative framework to ensure that they eliminate sex discrimination.[1] An important element in that framework is the designation of an official responsible for coordination of compliance efforts. Because the regulation identifies no specific duties, the "potential scope of . . .coordination responsibilities extends throughout every aspect of an agency's policies, programs and practices" (McCune and Mathews, 1978, p. 16). McCune and Mathews argue that, "the effectiveness of the Title IX coordinator is one of the critical elements in the achievement of Title IX compliance and sex equity in any school district" (1978, p. 16).

Research on school district compliance with the law has produced some descriptive information about Title IX coordinators. Surveys have documented the positions coordinators hold, the amount of time they spend on sex equity, the resources available to them, and their perceptions of their duties. In addition, a coordinator typology has been developed from two multi-state studies.

The research reported here is part of a study of the implementation of Title IX in public school districts. Concerned with describing and explaining the ways districts interpret the law and determine how to respond, the study sought to understand events from the perspectives of individuals in the context of their positions in complex organizations.

The understanding of the law and the strategies to implement it developed by seven Title IX coordinators are presented here in a series of case studies. Analysis of the case studies provides some insight into

they ways in which districts and coordinators have responded to a newly created, ambiguous role and how those responses affect the implementation process.

Background

To advocates of educational sex equity, a school district's treatment of the Title IX coordinator's position is one measure of its intent to comply with the letter and spirit of the law. Bornstein (1981) argues that the appointment of a coordinator who lacks commitment, experience, job description, authority, and mandate for change and has other job responsibilities indicates a low level of compliance. Conversely, a high level of compliance with both the letter and the spirit of the law is evident in a district whose coordinator has a clear job description and a mandate for change in addition to a personal commitment to equity.

McCune and Mathews (1978) explain that the Title IX coordinator's success depends upon district support. They identify three "principles" necessary for the coordinator's effective performance: the coordinator must have a written job description that is disseminated throughout the district; the coordinator must have, or be given training needed to acquire, the required competencies, or have access to others with those abilities; and the coordinator must have the information and authority, or access to authority, needed to enforce the law and to mandate programs and actions.

Much research on the Title IX coordinator appears designed to compare the actual work conditions in school districts with this standard. It is evident that most districts do not provide this structure and support.

Initial data on the Title IX coordinator typically were collected as part of single-state surveys on Title IX compliance conducted by

doctoral students in education or by public interest groups. While this research is limited, it has provided general information on how school districts have defined the role.

Most public school districts have designated a coordinator, though not all did so by the required deadline. A survey of Tennessee districts conducted the first year the regulations were in effect found that 90 percent of the districts had appointed a coordinator. This requirement was met more often than any other administrative requirement (Turetzky, 1979). A 1978 American Civil Liberties Union survey found that "most districts" in Washington State had appointed coordinators ("Title IX Action Limited," 1978). In a sample of 50 Iowa districts, 29 percent had designated a coordinator in 1975, 39 percent in 1976, 19 percent in 1977 and 13 percent in 1978 (Garcia, 1979).

Coordination responsibilities usually are added to those of an existing position. While a central office administrator typically receives the appointment, Title IX coordination has been assigned to a wide range of positions in school districts. In Tennessee, 23 percent of the coordinators were superintendents or assistant superintendents; 58 percent held middle management positions such as director, principal or supervisor; and 7 percent were teachers (Turetzky, 1979). In a stratified random sample of 25 Alabama school districts, one-fifth of the coordinators were assistant superintendents. The remaining districts added Title IX responsibilities to other central office positions including the ESEA director, director of public relations, junior high curriculum coordinator, attendance supervisor and personnel specialist (Lane, 1977). A large minority of coordinators sampled in Iowa also held central office positions. Twenty-eight percent were superintendents, 8 percent were assistant

superintendents and 2 percent were district-wide chairpersons. Twenty-six percent were principals, 2 percent were assistant principals, 18 percent were counselors, 14 percent were teachers and 2 percent were librarians (Garcia, 1979). An Illinois survey found that nearly half the coordinators in the state were superintendents ("Viewpoint," 1978).

Where evidence is available, it shows that coordinators spend little time on sex equity responsibilities. The average coordinator in the Illinois survey spent less than an hour a week on Title IX ("Viewpoint," 1978). In Iowa, 44 percent of the coordinators spent an hour or less a month, 44 percent spent between one and four hours a month, and only 8 percent devoted the equivalent on one working day--eight or more hours--a month on Title IX related activities.

Districts rarely provide the coordinators with job descriptions, nor do they formally evaluate the performance of Title IX responsibilities. In Washington State, "hardly any" coordinators had written job descriptions (PEER, 1978). Similarly, in the Iowa sample, only 12 percent had written job descriptions, and only 17 percent reported that their immediate supervisors (or board in the case of superintendents) evaluated their performance as Title IX coordinators (Garcia, 1979).

In Iowa, districts provided additional, though not substantial, resources to the coordinator. Only 2 percent of the sample received supplemental pay or office space. Four percent had extended contracts, and 8 percent had released time in which to carry out Title IX responsibilities. Thirty-four percent of the coordinators had secretarial help, and 68 percent had been given released time to attend workshops or visit schools. Thirty-four percent had access to funds earmarked for Title IX (Garcia, 1979). Data on the amount of released time and funding were not reported.

Not surprisingly, Garcia found that the majority of the coordinators in his sample "pursued a minimum number" of the activities he considered important for implementing the law. Most concentrated their efforts on seeking information rather than actively involving themselves in promoting change. Many coordinators actively sought information about Title IX. Forty-eight percent had attended one or two workshops, 18 percent had attended three or four workshops, and 6 percent had attended five or more. However, a substantial minority of 28 percent had never attended a workshop. Coordinators were involved in formal or informal grievance processes in a small minority of districts. Six percent had dealt with formal grievances filed by staff members, while 4 percent had dealt with formal student grievances. Ten percent had dealt informally with staff grievances, and 19 percent had handled student grievances informally. Women appeared more active than men in this area. A higher percentage of women than of men felt grievances should be handled by referring them to the appropriate agency or person. Female coordinators received more grievances than did males. In all cases, coordinators in central office positions were more active than those with building-level assignments.

Garcia also asked coordinators first to rate the importance of seventeen possible coordinator activities then to rate the importance they thought their districts attached to them. Discrepancies that could produce role conflict were evident. At least 50 percent of the respondents rated the following fourteen activities as "important" or "very important:" Refer those who have a grievance to the appropriate person or agency (80%); stay current on the literature relevant to Title IX (72%); provide leadership in fulfilling requirements of Title IX (70%); monitor Title IX in district (68%); maintain records regarding Title IX compliance (68%); provide

inservice programs designed to help staff eliminate sex bias (66%); make formal presentations to certified staff (62%); represent the school district in dealing with those who have a grievance (60%); serve as an arbiter in deciding on the validity and solutions of Title IX grievances (56%); search out Title IX violations (56%); attend workshops or conferences on Title IX (54%); represent those who have grievances when dealing with district authorities (52%); prepare periodic reports regarding Title IX compliance (50%); and make formal presentations to parents/community groups (50%).

In contrast, at least 50 percent thought their districts consider only the following six activities important: Stay current on the literature relevant to Title IX (62%); refer those who have a grievance to the appropriate person or agency (60%); represent the school district in dealing with those who have a grievance (54%); provide leadership in fulfilling the requirements of Title IX (54%); maintain records regarding Title IX compliance (52%); and, make formal presentations to administrators (52%).

Coordinators were more likely than their districts to define the role in active terms entailing contact with a wide range of people and agencies outside the district as well as within it. Such a coordinator might serve as an advocate of particular changes. However, the coordinators tended to think that their districts prefer them to restrict their attention to meeting administrative requirements and representing district interests. They perceived little district support for the advocacy of change.

Although Garcia offers no explanation for this discrepancy in defining the coordinator role, at least two are possible. Districts may have selected as coordinators individuals who are predisposed to an activist

posture toward Title IX or any other responsibility. It is also possible that coordinators, who may have had little knowledge about the law before assuming the position, were affected by their activities in seeking information and attempting to bring their districts into compliance with the law. These activities may have made them assume a more active orientation.

The discrepant role expectations do not appear to promote serious role conflict. Most coordinators in Garcia's sample were comfortable with their roles. Twenty-two percent were "very comfortable," and 32 percent were "somewhat comfortable." Twenty-four percent were "somewhat uncomfortable," and two percent were "very uncomfortable." Women were more likely than men to be comfortable with the coordinator role.

This body of research is limited by the resources available to doctoral students and by the compliance-oriented focus of local advocacy organizations. However, the findings of these state-level surveys tend to be consistent with those of two large, multi-state studies. These more complex studies used more methods of data collection and analysis. Both found three clear sets of behavior patterns among Title IX coordinators.

Miller and Associates (1978) studied districts in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Alaska as part of a compliance study. Ninety-seven percent of the coordinators combined Title IX responsibilities with other duties. A typology of coordinator roles emerged from data collected in paper and pencil surveys and site visits. Coordinators may serve as "advocates," "compliance officers" or "defenders of the insitution." "Advocates" tend to express commitment to the "spirit of Title IX" to provide equal educational opportunity. Often using informal persuasion, they directly assist with program revisions and promote philosophical agreement with the law. "Compliance officers" tend to limit their activities to formal

enforcement--evaluating institutional compliance and ordering or recommending corrective actions. While "advocates" and "compliance officers" work to implement the law, the "defender of the institution" works against full implementation, resisting the pressures of special interest groups and minimizing federal intervention. Although individuals may emphasize one of these roles, Miller and Associates suggest that districts may require coordinators to enact all three mutually contradictory roles.

Miller and Associates suggest that the coordinator's role orientation depends on the individual's own commitment to sex equity, the support of the administration, faculty, community and students and idiosyncratic factors. However, the most salient factor is the expectation of the school district's administration. When top administrators are committed to Title IX objectives, the coordinator often serves as an advocate. When the top administration is indifferent, the coordinator functions as a compliance officer. When the administration is openly negative, the coordinator often serves as a "defender of the institution" (Miller and Associates, 1978).

Hill and Rettig (1980) found similar patterns of behavior in their examination of 12 school districts in five states. They classified coordinators as "administrators," "advocates" or "apologists." "Administrators," analogous to Miller and Associates' "compliance officers," "ensure the propriety of local processes" but do not press for substantive changes in district policy. They tend to confine their activities to conducting the self-evaluation, assuring that grievances are handled according to the terms of the grievance procedure, and disseminating information. If program changes are made, they are made by others in the district.

"Advocates," like those identified by Miller and Associates, actively promote change. Only two of the twelve coordinators fit this category. "Advocates" have personal connections with outside interests, and they use them to promote change. For example, they actively solicited the participation of interested outside groups in the self-evaluation. "Advocates" also orchestrate interest group pressure on the school board and administration. Avoiding confrontation tactics, they serve as a major source of pressure for district self-initiated responses to civil rights guarantees. They also advise potential users of the grievance procedure and urge the school district to correct deficiencies.

Both "advocates" and "administrators" promote change in their districts, though "administrators" generate less pressure for locally initiated responses. However, the "apologists" operate to limit change. Apologist coordinators conduct the self-evaluation as quietly and on as small a scale as possible and try to "head off" complaints before they reach the grievance process. In dealing with external groups, "apologists" explain policy and try to shield the district from outside pressures. Locally initiated responses to civil rights guarantees is weaker in districts with "apologist" coordinators than in those with "administrators" and "advocates." Change occurs as a result of informal pressures brought by others rather than from the coordinator's efforts.

Hill and Rettig argue that "the coordinator's orientation is usually no accident." Coordinators are chosen to do what the superintendent wants. This was especially obvious in the smaller districts where the coordinators were either the superintendent or a senior member of the superintendent's staff.

Conclusions

The research described above has provided considerable descriptive information about Title IX coordinators. It is evident that most districts have complied with the requirement that a coordinator be designated, and most have added the coordination responsibilities to the duties of another position--usually that of a central office administrator. It appears that the tasks of Title IX coordination tend to be subordinated to other duties. With few exceptions, coordinators devote minimal amounts of time to Title IX. They are unlikely to have a formal job description or to be evaluated for their performance of Title IX coordination. They rarely receive additional resources to carry out the Title IX responsibilities.

Sex equity advocates tend to argue that bureaucratic structure determines the coordinator's effectiveness. They consider clear job descriptions, the resources of adequate knowledge and the authority to carry out responsibilities, and an official policy or mandate for change to be essential (e.g. McCune and Mathews, 1978; Bornstein, 1981). Following this position, Garcia (1979) concluded that districts could improve coordinator effectiveness by defining responsibilities more clearly and holding coordinators accountable for their performance. Noting that women in his survey were more comfortable and active in the role than men, he suggested that districts hire more women as coordinators.

In contrast, Hill and Rettig (1980) and Miller and Associates (1978) emphasize personal characteristics over organizational conditions as determinants of success. Hill and Rettig explain:

> It is important that [coordinators] have the confidence of the president or superintendent. be concerned about civil rights, and be politically skillful (1980, p. 43).

While they found variations in the amount of time coordinators spend on Title IX, the amount of resources given coordinators, and the presence of job descriptions, they did not indicate that these differences were associated consistently with differences in coordinator styles or effectiveness. Miller and Associates (1978) also found no common organizational conditions associated with effectiveness. Instead, they argue that it depends on idiosyncratic personal and organizational factors.

Both studies also found that superintendents' expectations shape coordinator behavior. However, those expectations apparently were not associated with organizational structure and support.

The research reviewed here has focused on school district compliance and on determining the effectiveness of the Title IX regulations. It has attempted to answer such questions as: Have districts appointed coordinators; if so, what supporting structures and resources have been provided; how much time do coordinators spend on Title IX; and do coordinators take active steps to implement the law? While these questions are important, answering them does not necessarily provide understanding of how coordinators function in the context of school district organizations. Surveys have shown that most coordinators are central office administrators who spend little time and few resources on Title IX and conform to their superintendents' expectations. However, there is little information about how districts and coordinators have responded to a newly created, ambiguous position with potentially all-encompassing responsibilities.

Methods and Data Sources

The data reported here were collected during a two-year study of the processes public school districts use to implement Title IX. Case studies were conducted in seven school districts ranging in size from 405 to over 90,000 students. Sites were selected in two stages.

In the first stage four districts in one state were selected using theory on diffusion and adoption of innovation. House (1974) found a pattern of adoption of educational innovations in which school district urban areas were first to adopt. Next to adopt were communities on major communications routes. Those last to adopt and first to abandon innovations were isolated school districts.

To examine implementation in districts likely to be at different stages of adoption, four districts were selected as initial sites: A suburban district of 33,404 students located in a greater metropolitan statistical area, a district of 4,460 in a small city with major state and federal government installations located in the same metropolitan area, a district of 7,044 in a small city located on a major interstate highway and the location of the major university in the state, and a district of 405 students in a rural area not located on any major communications routes. So little variation in the districts' responses to Title IX was found that districts for the second stage of the study were chosen to represent districts that had taken a more active role in seeking funds and establishing staff training activities. Those districts included a rural district of 5,126 students that was serving as a demonstration site for materials funded by the Women's Educational Equity Act Program,[2] a southwestern district of approximately 80,000 students in the rapidly growing "sun belt," and an urban district of 91,940 in the Great Lakes region.

An extensive body of data was collected in each district. Board members, central office administrators, principals, faculty and community members were interviewed. In some cases, classes and formal meetings were observed. Minutes of school board meetings and curriculum committee meetings, district self-studies, position papers, applications for funding, job announcements and other documents were collected and analyzed.

Interviews with Title IX coordinators followed a semi-structured format that provided for collection of comparable data for each individual while allowing flexibility to explore individual differences. Most interviews were cape recorded then transcribed. Notes were taken during the interviews not recorded and transcribed immediately after completing each interview.

Questions attempted to elicit responses that would provide an understanding of how the coordinators defined the "reality" of their position. They described how they learned about the law, why they were assigned coordination responsibilities and how they undertook to fulfill them.

Findings

The seven coordinators interviewed for this study fit only two of the three categories Miller and Associates (1978) and Hill and Rettig (1980) identified. Probably because their districts were in compliance with the law, none served as an "apologist/defender of the institution." They acted either as "administrators/compliance officers" or as 'advocates." This section describes the coordinators in each category, providing enough descriptive information to show how they approach their roles and carry out their responsibilities.

Before describing the coordinators, it is important to examine two definitions of Title IX and "equal educational opportunity." The coordinators' interpretations of the law have shaped their efforts to implement it.

Formal and Substantive Definitions of Title IX

Bornstein (1981) explains that Title IX may be given either a formal or a substantive interpretation. The formal interpretation defines the law's purpose as the elimination of discriminatory policies and practices and the assurance of equal access to programs and activities. The substantive interpretation views non-discrimination and equal access as intermediate steps toward the goals of equal participation rates and equal benefits. Bornstein delineates a seven-stage equity continuum that includes both the formal and the substantive interpretations. As a district progresses from one stage to the next, it eliminates discriminatory policies and practices, then institutes fair rules and equal access. At this stage, the district is in compliance with the law's formal requirements. However, to provide substantive equal opportunity, a district will promote equal participation through affirmative programs that address the effects of past sex bias. In the final stages, equal participation rates and equal success rates will be evident.

Coordinators holding the formal interpretation of the law will implement the procedural requirements and assure that policies allow students of either sex access to all programs and activities. An active coordinator with this orientation will see that information about the district's non-discrimination policies and grievance procedures is disseminated regularly to staff, students and parents; conduct an in-depth self-evaluation and encourage the identification of problems; and regularly monitor conditions in the schools. An inactive coordinator will assure that the district is in "paper compliance."

Coordinators seeking to achieve substantive equal opportunity will undertake affirmative action to overcome the effects of past sex bias.

Such efforts include: training staff to understand the effects of sex bias, to recognize bias in curriculum, materials and behavior, and to plan strategies for eliminating such bias: conducting system-wide review of publications, program descriptions, and materials to eliminate sexist language and stereotyping; and encouraging teachers, counselors, administrators and students to initiate their own equity-related activities.

The Administrator/Compliance Officer

Three coordinators were "administrators" or "compliance officers." They stressed the formal requirements of Title IX. All were white males holding central office administrative positions--Assistant Superintendent for Business, Assistant Superintendent for Personnel, and Director of Federal Programs. For two, the coordinator role clearly was subordinate to the primary administrative role. For the Director of Federal Programs, the Title IX duties were a logical extension of responsibilities for other federal laws and programs. All three accepted the formal interpretation of the law.

The Grievance Officer

The Assistant Superintendent for Business held the most passive orientation to the coordinator role imaginable. When interviewed, he had just been relieved of the assignment, after serving for three years. Appointed after the district had conducted its self-evaluation, he did not know how it had been done, who had been involved, or what findings and recommendations were reported. He did not have a copy of the district's self-evaluation. During his tenure, the superintendent who appointed him was replaced. In the change of administrations, the Title IX self-study was lost. When the new superintendent requested a copy, no one could find it.

The Assistant Superintendent for Business did not remember whether his exact title had been "coordinator" or "grievance officer." However, he functioned as a grievance officer. This function provided the rationale for assigning the Title IX responsibilities to his office. The superintendent had thought that most complaints would arise in the personnel area. To avoid conflict of interest he appointed the only central office administrator not involved directly with personnel decisions. Since no formal grievances had been filed under the district's grievance procedure, this coordinator had never been required to do anything.

The Grievance Officer made minimal efforts to inform himself about the law or possible coordinator responsibilities. His major source of information was informal conversations with administrators in other districts. He explained: "If you hear about problems in other districts, you might pay attention." He had not attended, nor was he aware of, meetings federal and state agencies had held in the area after the regulations were published. He did not keep an accessible file on Title IX and had to ask his secretary to find the district's grievance procedures. He saw no need to seek technical assistance from outside agencies.

As Grievance Officer, he confined his responsibility to being available when a formal grievance was filed. He did not serve as a source of expertise about the law and took no active role in monitoring the district. His role was so peripheral that he was not even called upon to serve as an "apologist" or "defender of the institution" when the district was accused of violations. He was not involved in an investigation that occurred when the local teachers' association filed a grievance with the Office of Civil Rights. Explaining that, "I wasn't asked to be a part of the investigation," he indicated that he knew neither what kinds of data were collected nor who was involved in that investigation.

He was replaced as "Title IX Grievance Officer" by a woman newly hired as an elementary school principal. While she had some training in equity issues as part of her graduate education, her orientation to the role resembled that of her predecessor. She too saw her responsibility as waiting for the filing of a formal grievance, then seeing that the district's Title IX grievance procedures were followed. She had not had to spend time on Title IX-related activities when interviewed after the first semester of her assignment.

The Compliance Officer

The other "administrators" were more active. They were responsible for conducting their district's self-evaluations, assuring the publication of statements that the district was in compliance with Title IX, and serving as a source of expertise about the requirements of the law. As both the Assistant Superintendent for Personnel and the Director of Federal Programs acted as compliance officers, only one will be described.

The Assistant Superintendent for Personnel exemplifies the "Compliance Officer" orientation. Upon receiving the coordinator assignment, he made an effort to inform himself about the law through official channels of communication and informal contacts with administrators in other districts. He read and kept on file communications regarding Title IX from the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare and attended one or two regional workshops sponsored by state and federal agencies. He read articles about the law when he came upon them in professional journals. However, he considered other administrators to be his most important source of information. He explained that when he hears that another district is doing something interesting or having some problems with Title IX, he talks with their coordinators or other administrators. He has never found it necessary

to contact the regional sex desegregation assistance center,[3] and when interviewed he was unaware of anything that the state department of education could offer.

The Assistant Superintendent for Personnel treated his Title IX responsibilities as another set of administrative duties. He explained that his style is to delegate and to give trust to subordinates in all areas. Thus, when a teacher contacted him to find out what the district was doing about Title IX, he assigned her major responsibility for conducting and writing the district self study, though he continued to participate in the process as a member of the self-study committee. After receiving the self-evaluation and the committee's recommendations, he sent memoranda to appropriate administrators. His memos noted specific violations, indicated appropriate corrective measures, and instructed administrators to take corrective action. For example, all building administrators were informed that principals generally had failed to notify students, staff and parents of the district's non-discrimination policy. He instructed principals to publicize that policy by posting it on faculty bulletin boards, incorporating it into the by-laws of school-sponsored organizations and clubs, and publishing it in the school newspapers and parent newsletters. Having done this, the Assistant Superintendent for Personnel made no efforts to monitor buildings to see that appropriate actions had been taken. Consistent with his style of trusting subordinates, he noted, "I take the principals' word" that they have complied with his directives.

Consequently, he had little knowledge of conditions in buildings. When asked to identify any buildings that might be exemplary, he could not do so. His only documented knowledge of the district's degree of

compliance with Title IX was a result of a routine review by the Office of Civil Rights. He stated that since OCR said the district was in compliance with Title IX, it must be.

In defining and discussing Title IX, this coordinator, as might be expected from a personnel administrator, concentrated on employment issues. He stressed his own commitment to equal opportunity and discussed the steps the district had taken to implement its affirmative action plan for hiring and promoting women and members of minority groups. For example, his office implemented an administrative internship program for women and minorities. Interns were released from their teaching positions for a semester or two and given special training and administrative experience. He argued that the district's board and administration took issues such as employment and access to courses and sports seriously.

While indicating support for equal access and equal employment opportunity, this coordinator was not sympathetic to other equity concerns, such as requirements that non-sexist language and pictures be used in course descriptions and program guides. He considered non-sexist language to be a "nit-picking" issue that diverted attention from the substance of the law. Thus, though officially committed to equal employment opportunity, he allowed to be issued from his office a vacancy notice for a senior high school assistant principal that consistently used the generic "he" to describe the assistant principal's duties, e.g., "He will supervise . . . He administers . . . He has responsibilities for . . ." This announcement contained no information about the district's equal opportunity and affirmative action policies. Informants in the district suggested that this was no accident, for the principal to whom the new assistant would report was reputed to be unwilling to hire a woman as an administrator.

The Assistant Superintendent for Personnel expressed the "administrator" orientation well when he defined his responsibility as carrying out his board's policy of complying with all federal regulations. He indicated that board members do not express resentment about federal intrusion. They want to be in compliance with all laws. He explained: "Even when the regulations don't make a lot of sense, the board wants to do what's right."

Conclusions

That the Title IX Coordinator holds an "administrator/compliance officer" orientation does not mean that the district is indifferent to implementing the letter and the spirit of the law. All three districts with "Administrators" had implemented administrative requirements of law and had eliminated or were eliminating discriminatory practices. For example, all classes in two districts and all but middle school or junior high school physical education in the other two were open to boys and girls. In one of the latter two districts, the junior high P.E. classes were coeducational in one junior high, and the district had mandated (against the wishes of principals and teachers) that the other two integrate classes the following fall. However, the initiative for these changes came from administrators with curriculum responsibilities, not from the Title IX coordinator. When principals and teachers dragged their feet, the superintendent not the coordinator directed them to change.

In all three districts, affirmative programs ranging from district-sponsored and funded administrative internship programs to planned activities and purposeful change initiated by principals and teachers had occurred. These curriculum and program changes were promoted by superintendents, directors, principals and teachers, not by the coordinators.

While discriminatory policies and practices generally had been eliminated, no concerted, district-wide efforts to assure substantive equal opportunity had occurred. None of the three districts had conducted staff development or inservice training on Title IX or sex equity. These topics were a low

priority for in-service. In one case, when the district was changing P.E. programs, principals rejected suggested training. Consequently, many teachers interviewed in the districts were unfamiliar with the law and with sex equity issues. When informed about the law, they often could not see how it might affect them unless they taught a formerly sex-typed course. In none of the three districts did the coordinator seek technical assistance from external agencies.

The Advocates

Four coordinators behaved as advocates. They all expressed personal commitment to the "spirit" of Title IX and actively promoted change in their district. All four held central office positions. Two were line administrators--a superintendent and a deputy superintendent. The other two held staff positions, one as Special Assistant to the Superintendent with responsibilities for "human rights" and staff development, the other as Title IX Coordinator in the Equal Employment Opportunity Office. All four defined their responsibilities in terms of promoting change; however, their interpretations of the law varied.

While classified as "advocates," the four coordinators exhibited diverse styles in the role. The "Superintendent" was the most difficult coordinator to classify. He serves as a transitional figure between the "administrator" and "advocate" categories, holding a formal interpretation of the law, but actively seeking to promote equal opportunity, particularly in the areas of athletics and administration.

The "Desegregator" held responsibilities for both race and sex desegregation in a district that actively resisted both. She worked to bring the district into compliance with the law's formal requirements while beginning to address issues of substantive equal opportunity.

The "Teacher trainer" stressed staff development and involved his district in a national demonstration program for educational equity. The final coordinator served as a "Broker," identifying and creating a market for equity services in her district and linking internal needs with external resources.

The Superintendent

The Superintendent of a rural midwestern district of approximately 400 students emphasized a formal interpretation of the law. This interpretation was coupled with an emphasis on excellence in all areas and an interest in students and staff as individuals. He never defined himself as a Title IX Coordinator. He instituted change as a superintendent.

Hired after the regulations had gone into effect, he initially worked to assure that the district was in compliance. He conducted an "informal" self study and found few discriminatory practices. Courses such as Home Economics and Industrial Arts were already open to all students. Girls had been prominent in Industrial Arts and in the district's Industrial Arts club and the national American Industrial Arts Student Association. High school P.E. classes were coeducational.

The district's equity emphasis became girls' athletics. The secondary principal explained: ". . .when we refer to Title IX, at least as far as I'm concerned or in rural education, you're talking basically about athletics." This community had had a history of girls' basketball until sometime in the 1950's. Many parents could remember these teams, which were active before consolidation. Thus competitive team sports for girls was not considered inappropriate. When the reinstituted girls' teams proved to be winners, they received school and community support.

The Superintendent and the secondary Principal actively promoted girls' sports in their district and in the league. Both volleyball and basketball attracted participants and local support. They were less successful in the league. The district continually has pressed to have schedules rotated so

that girls' teams have the opportunity to play the "feature game." They had not been able to change league practices (supported by all other rural districts in the league) and girls' events continued to be scheduled before boys' events.

Some women teaching in the district reported that the Superintendent had encouraged them to enroll in administrator certification programs. The Superintendent and Principal helped one teacher develop and conduct independent projects during a summer when she was pregnant and unable to commute to the nearest university. She needed the credits to complete a degree in educational administration.

The Superintendent considered his school a leader in many areas, including the implementation of Title IX. He saw the success of girls' volleyball and basketball teams as one of many examples of the district's commitment to excellence. He took justifiable pride in the nearly completed secondary school which would have excellent (and equal) facilities for boys and girls as well as access to all areas for handicapped students and visitors. The district had a record of success in competitive events of all kinds, athletic, scholarship, and music. Girls' athletics was just one aspect of that record.

However, sex equity was not an issue in the district. No inservice on Title IX or sex equity had ever been offered. Many teachers, particularly at the elementary level, had never heard of equity concerns in areas of curriculum, materials, or classroom behavior. A counselor explained that girls avoid physics, chemistry and computer science, and plan for stereotypically feminine careers. Junior high P.E. instructors were unreceptive to coeducational classes.

Administrative leadership, from both the Superintendent and secondary Principal, was responsible for equal access and a successful girls' athletic program. Both men personally were committed to equity. The district did not address the substantive aspects of Title IX systematically. The Superintendent's

active promotion of change distinguishes him from the "administrator/compliance officer" coordinators.

The Desegregator

An "advocate" who emphasized both formal and substantive aspects of equal opportunity served as Special Assistant to the Superintendent in a district of approximately 90,000 students in the upper Midwest. When the Superintendent created the position, with responsibilities in "human rights" and staff development, the Title IX Coordinator responsibilities were transferred to this new office. The Special Assistant was appointed after the district had conducted its self-evaluation. While she had not participated in the self-evaluation process and had not been an activist for women's issues in the community or district, she expressed a personal commitment to equity and had opposed sex discrimination as a teacher before Title IX was enacted. For example, she had succeeded in placing a girl in a construction training program that had been designated for boys only.

As both the first woman and the first member of a minority group to hold a cabinet-level position in the district, she had to establish her legitimacy as an administrator and define her role as a human rights specialist. With no formal job description and limited resources, she confronted many pressing concerns in the district. Initially, Title IX was not a priority. She recalled:

> I think my appointment was in response to pressure. Having been appointed, it was left to me to develop the job description. . .I had at first not even a secretary.
>
> I will confess that the first year, or maybe even beyond that--the first year and a half--the cost of all of the other kinds of things that were housed in my office, I could not, without staff, give the time and attention to Title IX that I should have given--would have liked to have given. Our thrust at that time was in desegregation on the basis of race. . .So I will confess, and be the first to do so, that attention to Title IX implementation and compliance was not a top priority item. I was concerned about it however, and it stayed always in the back of my mind.

Pressure, both internal and external, brought Title IX to the forefront of her responsibilities.

The district had a history of interest group activity in women's issues. In 1973 the school board had established a Special Committee on Women's Rights that emphasized employment issues. After the Title IX implementing regulations had been published, the recently appointed Superintendent pressed for establishment of board policies on affirmative action and human rights. He sponsored a Title IX study session in which invited representatives of the state education agency and various statewide educational organizations and members of staff met with a representative from the Office of Civil Rights to plan the implementation of the law. To conduct the self-evaluation he appointed a 15-member committee consisting of representatives from employee unions, the inter-high school student council, the district-wide parent-teacher council, school counselors and psychologists and the city chapter of the National Organization for Women. Active members of this group, both district employees and the representatives of the National Organization for Women continued to press the district to implement the committee's recommendations and informally monitored district efforts.

When the Special Assistant was designated Coordinator, she began to receive pressure. With neither information about changes occurring in the district nor staff to seek and compile such information, she could not give the pressure groups the information they demanded. Former members of the self-evaluation team, recalling that they felt "nothing had happened" to remedy the problems uncovered in the self-evaluation, filed a complaint with the district. They, the district, and the regional Office of Civil Rights negotiated a compromise in which the district promised to make specific changes if the complaint was dropped.

The Special Assistant considered those pressures critical in making Title IX a priority and in having resources allocated to her office.

> It was only when we began to get some pressure. . .that I was given the kind of support in terms of staff--one secretary--that I needed in order to be able to respond to some of the concerns.

She worked with the small group that filed the complaint. She helped them monitor the district and capitalized on the threat of future grievances that they represented. She could advocate specific changes with the argument that they would help the district avoid an OCR investigation or a lawsuit.

While pressure was building for a more active effort to implement the law, the Special Assistant was working to legitimize her new position and responsibilities within the district. Determined not to be "meek and humble and kind of mousy in the background" she established herself as an assertive proponent of human rights issues. For example, she addressed the issue of sexist language in cabinet meetings.

> When I first came here I would just interrupt. . .anytime "he does" this and "he does" that, I would just interrupt and say "she" and "her." Just out of the sheer hell I would do it. And they would be so angry with me. But you know, now they have come around, and they will say "him or her". . .They have come around. . .some of these folks have done just a complete turnaround on the matter of recognizing that women are a force in society to be reckoned with.

With acceptance from other administrators, the support of the Superintendent and the threat of external pressure, she was able to press for changes.

She actively sought to change practices in individual schools. She had many opportunities to correct discriminatory practices. For example, a "gentlemen's agreement" in many schools provided for separate lunch periods for boys and girls. Teachers supported this arrangement because they thought single-sex lunches reduced discipline problems. The teachers' union supported this position. To reduce the potential district-wide resistance to integrated lunch periods, the Special Assistant adopted a strategy of "breaking" one or two schools. Having forced one or two schools to end a discriminatory practice, the policy was established. She noted that the other schools then changed when "word went out" from the central office that separate lunch periods were no longer acceptable. She was not reluctant to challenge principals.

She identified a number of other discriminatory practices.

> Other kinds of things we had to contend with were separate playground areas, separate entrances, separate drinking fountains in the building--can you imagine that? Boys on one side of the room--seating patterns that were discriminatory, classroom duties and responsibilities and that kind of thing.

She utilized building "liaisons" established under the OCR negotiated settlement as an information network to identify discriminatory practices. She also worked closely with central office specialists to eliminate bias in testing, counseling, and placement of special education students.

To expand her resources, the Special Assistant sought assistance and funding from external agencies. She obtained CETA workers for her division. She took advantage of the expertise and funds of the state education agencies and the regional sex desegregation assistance center to offer sex equity training to the building liaisons, administrators and teachers. She successfully applied for a local education agency grant under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This grant supported a full-time sex equity specialist and money for in-service training. The individual hired for the sex equity specialist position was one of the individuals who had filed the complaint with the school system.

She also succeeded in gaining support and resources from the school district itself. The allocation of hard money to her unit was a satisfying achievement.

> I felt so good that, in spite of our efforts not to raise taxes in this district, in spite of the fact that we are, as a large urban district, being abandoned by industry and business that really form our tax base, and in spite of the fact that we are having flight, both black and white, from our city, I was gratified by the fact that [the board] would have appropriated $15,000. Because there were other programs that they said, "Absolutely no! Absolutely not! You won't get a penny from us." And I think that next year when we go back they will be willing to increase that, depending on how well we do our task this year.

This Title IX Coordinator was more active than any other in the study in forcing specific changes in school buildings. Because she had to deal with visible and widespread discriminatory practices, she stressed equal access. At

the same time, she sought resources and supported independent efforts to help the district achieve substantive equal opportunity.

The Teacher Trainer/Demonstrator

A third "advocate" emphasized the substantive interpretation of the law, though his responsibilities initially had included assuring that the district was in formal compliance. The Deputy Superintendent of a Northwest Coast rural-consolidated district of approximately 5,000 students had been appointed as coordinator "by default." A non-minority male, he neither knew nor cared about Title IX when given the assignment. He recalled:

> I had Title IX because we needed to do something with Title IX, so I was given added responsibility. [He was appointed in 1976 after the deadline for implementing this requirement.] I didn't know Title IX from Title VII from Title XXIII at that point.

However, he took his responsibility seriously and set about informing himself. He found "lots of quality training activities" available through the state department of education and the General Assistance Center. This training gave him confidence in his ability not only to conduct the district's self-evaluation and recommend appropriate changes but also to conduct teacher training on sex equity.

Taking advantage of a state certification requirement that all teachers and administrators must demonstrate knowledge of laws prohibiting discrimination, he designed an equity workshop. His district was one of the few in the state that offered this required training to its teachers at no cost. The workshop also was offered to teachers in other districts. He used the workshops as an opportunity to not only cover the laws but to look at the spirit of the laws and discuss how that spirit can be implemented in the classroom.

The Deputy Superintendent sought and received extensive help from the regional General Assistance Center. The center's staff conducted some workshops in the district and helped the coordinator design the self-study. They provided information and guidance on available resources and materials and on

change strategies. They also "keyed [the Deputy Superintendent] into other people who were active in the state."

Because of his statewide contacts with others active in promoting sex equity, his name surfaced when a regional laboratory was developing a proposal to operate a demonstration site through the Women's Educational Equity Act Program. He gathered information needed for the application and gained the support and permission of board and administration required for participation in the project. The district's participation as a demonstration site brought additional resources into the district. Funds were available for building-level Title IX liaisons in three demonstration schools, for a full-time sex-equity specialist, for the purchase of materials and for travel. When interviewed at the end of the district's first year as a demonstration site, the Deputy Superintendent could document extensive and intensive training, special events, that had impacted teachers and students in his district. His district not only was in compliance with the letter of the law; he felt it had made great strides toward implementing the spirit as well.

Others in the district attributed its progress almost entirely to the Deputy Superintendent. Having line authority to implement needed changes, personal commitment to follow through on any obligation, and the respect of others in the district, this coordinator made sex equity a major issue in his district. In addition, his activities changed his own orientation to sex equity, explaining that he has "come a long way" in changing his attitudes.

The Broker

The final "advocate" was the only coordinator in the study with a full-time assignment to Title IX. Housed in the Equal Employment Opportunity Office of a Southwestern district of approximately 80,000 students, the position was created in a climate of superintendent and board of education support for sex equity. Thus, this was also the only district in which the position of

Title IX Coordinator was advertised throughout the district and filled after competing candidates had been interviewed and evaluated.

The coordinator selected was not a "raging feminist," nor had she been involved in sex equity concerns in the school district or community before her appointment. An English teacher in one of the district's high schools, she was sensitive to equity issues in general and had developed a course to foster awareness and understanding of the cultures represented in the Southwest.

The position has a written job description that includes nine areas of responsibility. The coordinator is responsible for disseminating and clarifying the regulations; planning and conducting workshops and in-service sessions for all personnel; integrating external technical assistance with the district's own projects; visiting individual schools both to encourage implementation of sex equity and to establish progress reports; assuring that complaints and grievances are promptly, thoroughly and fairly handled; responding to federal compliance mandates; reporting on the status of equity in the district in its publications; preparing an annual report to the Superintendent that summarizes district efforts; and serving as the coordinator of a state-sponsored vocational opportunity program.

When confronted with the job description, the new coordinator thought: "Oh, that isn't what they want. That isn't what anybody has to do." She recalled, "It sounded like too much, but it was in fact the job description." Feeling unprepared, she immediately set out to learn the job. Rather than seeking guidance internally, she sought information from the regional Sex Desegregation Assistance Center, which had just begun operation.

The first week of her employment was spent at the SDAC participating in "intensive" training. She learned "what this whole thing is about, what was expected, what Title IX compliance would mean."

She joined the National Coalition for Sex Equity in Education, an organization of professionals with sex equity responsibilities in educational organizations, and attended its first national conference. Through these contacts she learned who were national experts in various equity areas. She did not hesitate to write or phone them for advice and information, and she used them as consultants. She explained:

> One of the things I've done probably better than anybody [else] could have done, because I like that part of my job, is really contact, make contact with a lot of people. I really am a part of a big network, maybe not a real active part. And I seem to be getting most of the benefits, I think.

While these activities were not explicit in the job description, the district supported the coordinator's travel to conferences and training sessions.

As a result of her participation in a network of sex equity professionals, the coordinator became aware of the availability of funds through Title IV of the Civil Rights Act. She successfully applied for funding to support additional training activity in her school district.

One of her first tasks as coordinator was to make her position and Title IX issues visible in the district. While she does send written information to schools and contributes to district newsletters, her primary means of gaining visibility is through personal contact.

> I have always felt really strongly about personal visits [to schools] and felt that it was not time wasted--that it was a good thing to try to see as many people as I can, even if it's just to say "Hi, I'm your Title IX Coordinator, and if you have any questions or want to know about something, you can call me." I mean sometimes it's just that casual. I know that making an appearance at a school is very important, much

> more important than I ever would have thought. I have realized that it's one of the ways to pave this whole process.

Personal characteristics and relationships as well as her strategies for approaching educators contribute to the success of her interactions with teachers and administrators. Her husband's position, her role as a parent with children in the district, and her experiences as a teacher in the district provide credibility.

> I feel comfortable with the district. I've been in the district fifteen years, and my husband has been an administrator for years. He's very well liked, very respected in the district. It gives me some credibility.

> I think experience has its virtue, and I use it a lot--the fact that I'm a mother, the fact that I've had kids in school--still do--and I still get caught up in their problems.

In working with teachers she stresses a non-threatening even-handed approach that treats Title IX less as a women's equity law than as a law for all children.

> I think a lot of people's fears have been allayed when I get there [to the schools] because I don't threaten people. I don't look terribly threatening.

> I clearly talk about boys and girls. I always talk about boys, and I think that's very important for a Title IX coordinator. Because if we're changing half the population, we're certainly changing the other half. And if we don't address it, we're really pretty stupid.

She does not emphasize compliance issues, but she works to help teachers see how sex bias works in the classroom.

Her efforts to gain visibility and credibility have resulted in increased use of her office as a source of information and an expansion of her responsibilities in the district. She has found that "most principals want me to come in, and they want to assure me that they've done everything they can--100% in compliance, that sort of thing." Principals have begun to refer parents with questions or concerns to her. She has developed a

reputation for giving people accurate information.

Students in increasing numbers, often at the instigation of a teacher, contact her for information.

> I just had two students in here Friday interviewing me for a project they were doing. And a number of teachers send students. . .I suppose it has a lot to do with whether people know you and people feel comfortable about saying, "Why don't you go down and talk to [the coordinator]?" So people come in for various projects from the schools to ask about Title IX. And we have had some very good explanations in student newspapers about Title IX from students to students.

She serves on committees that are not directly related to Title IX. For example, she served on the steering committee for a career exploration program the Girl Scouts wanted to operate in some schools. The Coordinator was concerned that the activity, though sponsored by Girl Scouts, would not be directed only to girls. She saw that the materials and activities were appropriate to children of both sexes, noting that "while this isn't strictly a Title IX endeavor," it is important to participate and to see that sex equity concerns are dealt with. She also participated on the steering committee for a project on world cultures and multicultural education, again concerning herself with seeing that the program promoted sensitivity to sex bias as well as religion, national origin, races and language.

When the federal guidelines on sexual harassment were issued, the Coordinator was asked to help develop the district policy and grievance procedure. She will serve as one of the grievance officers when the plan goes into effect.

In addition to establishing the visibility and credibility of her office, the Coordinator has stressed teacher training. During the first year she utilized the resources of the regional SDAC and a Title IX Training

Institute. She successfully applied for a grant under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act to support additional teacher training the second year. This support has allowed the district to train representatives from every school. In conferences and retreats teachers were made aware of the law, of the impact of various forms of sex discrimination on students and society, and of materials and teaching strategies to overcome the effects of sex bias. Some teachers were given training in how to train other teachers before returning to their schools to conduct in-service sessions on sex equity.

The direct effects of these sessions have been mixed. The impact in a school largely depends on the principal's support. School principals, not the coordinator, select teachers to participate in the training and control the resources needed if they are to conduct in-service training in the school. Principals, not the coordinator, have the authority to decide whether or not any follow-up training will occur at the school. Some principals not only supported in-service on sex equity but participated in it and provided the teachers who had been trained with substitutes for a day or two so that they could develop an effective workshop for the school. Others would not approve any training at all.

The district-wide training sessions promoted interest in Title IX. As a result, many participants have asked the Coordinator to conduct sex equity presentations in their schools. She feels this training and personal contact is essential if teachers are to be reached, for teachers tend to ignore laws and federal programs unless they are involved directly with them.

Initially, the coordinator defined her role as that of a broker, matching available external services with internal needs. She actively

worked to create a market for equity assistance in her district by establishing and maintaining informal contacts with building administrators. At the same time she involved herself in a national network of equity professionals so that she was aware of available services, materials and consultants. Her efforts to bring in outside assistance served the needs of external agencies as well as those of her district. She explained:

> They [the regional SDAC] needed us as much as we needed them, you know. They had to have somebody to service.

In addition to bringing in workshops and other pre-packaged training activities, she was able to match outside expertise with internal needs as they arose. For example, when the federal sexual harassment guidelines were issued, she was able to bring in a well-known consultant who had been well-received in the district before to discuss the topic with administrators.

As she grew more confident of her own expertise and skill in working with teachers, she began to conduct in-service training for teachers herself. Her approach to teachers was similar to the initial approach to administrators. She deemphasized compliance issues, because, she explained,

> Title IX, that whole bit with a 'title,' sort of scares people off--especially people that are kind of turned off by federal programs anyway.

She structures her presentations so that

> I don't spend a whole lot of time with the business of the law, because we want to get to the spirit of the law. We want to encourage. . .I try to get into how it really affects them [as teachers].

As a former teacher, she empathizes with teacher concerns about federal programs and central office pressures to change. She does not threaten, preach, or pass judgment. She is optimistic about the success of this strategy:

> Now I'm sure there are some very hard-nosed ones in there that will never change. But I honestly believe that we can bring a lot of these people around by presenting these things as if they were the most reasonable things in the world.

To be successful in her role as expert, helper and provider of resources, she has avoided the monitoring responsibilities in the coordinator's job description. She has not been required to deal with grievances or complaints, and thus has not been involved in direct attempts to change building practices. She does not collect information about building practices systematically, and was surprised when the interviewer described lunchroom segregation in one of the schools. Thus, she has not experienced role conflict.

Although the coordinator has concentrated on teacher training, she sees activities directed at students as a future priority. The district has begun to take steps in that direction by conducting and participating in activities designed to interest girls in math and science. The coordinator has assumed that if teachers are made aware of sex equity, they will develop student activities as well as treating students more equitably.

Summary

The descriptions of the seven coordinators have been arranged along a rough continuum. At one end is a coordinator who limited his role to that of "grievance officer." His orientation to the Title IX responsibilities was passive. More active are two administrators whose orientation might be labeled that of the "compliance officer." They defined their role as one of taking steps to assure that their districts were in compliance with the administrative requirements and the letter of the law. Having done so, they felt they had discharged their responsibilities. They took little continuing action beyond being available to meet with outsiders such as OCR staff or this researcher or to provide information. At

best, the Administrator/Compliance Officer coordinators assured paper compliance with Title IX. At worst, they did nothing. Four coordinators actively promoted change in their districts.

The superintendent implemented the equal access provisions of the law, especially promoting an exemplary girls' athletics program. He was not concerned with changes in curriculum, materials, and teacher behaviors. Though he saw some teachers' attitudes as a problem, he sought no external assistance to help change those attitudes. Two "advocates" addressed both the formal and the substantive interpretations of Title IX. The "Desegregator" implemented an effective strategy to end discriminatory practices in buildings and sought resources to help staff make appropriate changes in testing, counseling, placement and in teacher behaviors. The "Teacher Trainer/Demonstrator" took the leadership in training teachers in his own district and others, and helped his district serve as a model of educational equity. The final "advocate" did not attend to the formal definition. She felt the district had taken adequate steps to assure equal access before her appointment, and thus she took the initiative required to help teachers understand and implement the "spirit of the law."

Analysis

Any attempt to explain why some coordinators become advocates while others develop an administrator/compliance officer orientation is frustrated initially by the many idiosyncratic differences among coordinators and their districts. Conditions identified in other studies as essential to coordinator effectiveness were not present in all districts where coordinators led change efforts.

For example, a community-based pressure group was active in only one district; but in that district it served to strengthen the coordinator's position and legitimate her active efforts to end discrimination. In another district a state requirement provided the coordinator an opportunity to offer his staff an appreciated service while providing them the training he felt they needed if they were to be able to work toward educational equity. In a third district, active women on the board of education and a new superintendent provided the impetus for creation of a full-time Title IX Coordinator position. In a rural community, a lapsed tradition of girls' athletics and a commitment to excellence promoted support for girls' inter-mural basketball and volleyball. These conditions provided opportunities for change but were not essential for coordinators to take an advocate orientation.

Personal and district characteristics did not appear to promote consistently different orientations. While all three administrator/compliance officer coordinators were white male administrators, two advocates were white men with line positions. The other two advocates were minority women. Two advocates were administrators in rural districts while two worked in urban communities. Two held line positions and two held staff positions.

Initial commitment to sex equity does not explain the differences. At the time of initial appointment, all seven coordinators held a similar level of understanding of the law. None were feminists or civil rights activists. Some coordinators even disavowed prior involvement and knowledge with disclaimers such as, "I am not a raging feminist," and "I didn't know Title IX from Title VII from Title XXIII at that point." Advocates and administrators started from an initial level of general commitment to implement the law but little specific knowledge about it. However,

in the course of carrying out their responsibilities, three of the coordinators began to understand, accept and work toward the substantive definition of equal opportunity.

Their processes for seeking information differentiated "advocates" from "administrators." Administrators sought information from official federal and state channels and from their usual informal contacts among administrators in other districts. The three advocates who addressed the substantive definition of Title IX looked beyond these traditional sources of information, seeking expertise from federally funded assistance centers and training institutes. This expertise provided an expanded definition of educational equity and of the tasks needed to implement it. Those who held a substantive definition of equal opportunity and considered teacher and administrator training essential to the implementation of the law had contact with sex equity professionals. Those who accepted the formal definition of the law and saw no need for training had no contact with this professional network. Only one coordinator with a formal interpretation of the law had participated in any outside training activities. The year after the regulations went into effect, he attended a workshop that addressed their administrative requirements.

This finding is consistent with one of the conclusions of the Hill and Rettig study. Noting the contrast between coordinators in school districts and those in universities, they described many university coordinators as "professional civil rights careerists" with membership in national organizations that provided both information and a sense of "professionalism that transcended any particular institution" (1980, p. 43). All "advocates" in their study had such outside connections. Thus they recommended that the federal government promote interaction among coordinators through state, regional and national meetings.

Through Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Women's Educational Equity Act Program the federal government provides some opportunity for interaction among coordinators and between coordinators and sex equity professionals. The effect of these programs on the Title IX coordinators who have had frequent contact with them clearly is significant. Participation in a professional network shapes the coordinator's understanding of the law, provides experts to help plan and implement specific change strategies in school districts, and allows for personal support and encouragement. As one coordinator explained: "I really am a part of a big network. . .and I seem to be getting most of the benefits . . ."

The source of their motivation to work also appears to distinguish advocates from other coordinators. Advocates seemed to gain intrinsic rewards from fulfilling their Title IX responsibilities. In discussing their achievements, they expressed pride and satisfaction. The Superintendent described the successes of his girls' teams or proudly showed visitors through the newly completed secondary school with its accommodations for high quality athletic programs for boys and girls. The "Desegregator" recalled satisfaction, noting: "I felt so good. . ." when the board appropriated money for Title IX. The "Broker" relayed a compliment in which she was told that "they certainly chose the right person for the job," and enumerated things she did "better than anybody [else] could have done."

In contrast, "administrators" communicated no such sense of accomplishment. The tasks associated with Title IX compliance were just another assignment. In at least one case the coordinator implied that he sometimes went through the motions of complying with requirements even when they made no sense.

None of the coordinators in this study experienced the organizational structures and supports that McCune and Mathews (1978) considered necessary for effective performance. Thus, it is impossible to assess the relative impact of these bureaucratic elements. Only one had a written position description. It was so broad, and she had enough autonomy, that she could choose to emphasize some responsibilities, exclude others, and add activities not mentioned in the original description. While the position description may have been disseminated throughout the district as part of the recruitment process, the coordinator found that she had to make her position known to others in personal interactions as well as through information in the district newsletter. After nearly two years of persistent effort to make the position visible, this coordinator still encountered audiences of teachers who did not know what the coordinator was.

In no case was a set of competencies determined and formally described. With the exception of the full-time coordinator, the position was filled "by default" or by assigning the duties to a central office administrator whose other responsibilities fit the superintendent's perception of the role. Since advocates tended to expand their role, they had to develop new competencies as they became necessary. Advocates took the initiative to learn about Title IX and educational equity and to develop their skills as workshop leaders, teacher trainers, grant writers and managers and anything else that became necessary. They did not depend on their districts for learning opportunities but sought them outside the district.

Advocates actively sought to expand the resources initially provided them. Administrator/compliance officer coordinators worked within the limits given them. Only the full-time coordinator was given adequate time and some resources with the appointment. The Special Assistant

recalled her difficulties as she confronted many demands without staff. She used a pressure group as a lever to gain a secretary and sought resources from external agencies--CETA and Title IV. She also took advantage of training that the state educational agency and the regional desegregation assistance center offered at no cost. She finally succeeded in establishing a line item in the school district budget for Title IX activities. Her own efforts, supplemented by external pressure for action, provided staff and funding. The Deputy Superintendent also substantially increased the resources available for sex equity activities. He took advantage of an opportunity to involve his district with an application to the WEEAP to serve as an educational equity demonstration site. The successful application produced funding for a full-time equity expert, part-time building equity liaisons, purchase of materials, travel and contact with outside experts.

Two coordinators also found that authority was not automatically associated with their assignment. The Special Assistant and the Title IX Coordinator initially had to establish the legitimacy of their offices and of themselves as women in primarily male administrator groups. This necessary step required persistent effort. The other advocates had the authority of their line positions, which was independent of the coordinator responsibilities.

While three of the advocates sought resources and gained expertise and authority, the three "administrators" appeared limited by their organizational positions. As central office staff administrators, their responsibilities did not include instruction or curriculum. They were not regularly involved in decision making in those areas and had no legitimate basis of expertise. In contrast, the Deputy Superintendent

had both line authority and perceived expertise in instruction and staff development. He was clearly comfortable in initiating changes in curriculum, programs and in-service training.

The Deputy Superintendent argued that line authority facilitates a coordinator's efforts to bring about change. While the Special Assistant lacked this authority, she had the support of the superintendent as she pushed individual schools to eliminate discriminatory practices. However, she also took advantage of the presence of a pressure group. Some of her authority came to rest on others' assumptions that she was doing what had to be done to keep the district out of court.

Coordinators responded to the ambiguity of the role in different ways. Those with an administrator/compliance officer orientation defined the role as a limited set of duties. Having completed the assigned tasks, they turned their attention to other matters. In contrast, three of the advocates enlarged the scope of the role, using it as an opportunity to initiate contacts outside as well as within the district, enhance their knowledge, skills and authority, and increase their resources.

Coordinator Effects

While differences in interpretation of Title IX and orientation to the coordinator role are obvious, it is more difficult to show clear evidence that these differences are associated with effects on programs and students. All seven districts in the study had eliminated discriminatory policies and practices and had undertaken some affirmative programs.

However, differential effects on teachers are observable. Coordinators who accepted the substantive interpretation of Title IX implemented in-service training on Title IX and sex equity issues. Districts whose coordinators held a formal interpretation had no such in-service training.

Training effects were evident when teachers were interviewed. Teachers who had participated in training activities were knowledgeable about the law and about sex equity issues. Those teachers in the educational equity demonstration schools, who had received the most intensive and extensive training, were most articulate. Teachers who had not received training were likely to be uninformed or to think of Title IX in terms of college athletics unless some personal interests or experiences had raised their awareness.

Teachers in the demonstration schools had impressionistic evidence that their training and subsequent changes in educational practices were having effects on students. (Formal evaluations were being conducted but were not completed at the time of the site visit.) For example, they could cite instances in which students corrected others who used the generic "he" or expressed aspirations about non-traditional careers. Teachers in other districts who had taken part in training could give examples of ways in which they had changed their classroom behaviors. However, they had no information on ways in which their changes may have affected students.

Where Title IX coordinators stressed staff training in educational equity, administrators and teachers who had participated were articulate about both the formal and substantive definitions of equal opportunity. They were aware of sex bias in classroom behavior and in materials and understood strategies for eliminating bias and overcoming its effects. They were less likely than staff with no training to define Title IX as a set of administrative procedures completed in the past or as a requirement that districts support girls' athletics. Thus these districts appeared to be moving more actively toward implementing substantive equal opportunity than districts where little or no teacher training occurred.

The major difference between those districts in this study in which coordinators were advocates and the others is in the progress toward achieving substantive equal opportunity. All districts had taken the steps required to eliminate discriminatory policies and practices and to assure equal access to courses and activities.

Footnotes

[1]The regulations require recipients of federal funds to: 1) Conduct a self-evaluation of policies and practices and their effects; 2) File an assurance of compliance with Title IX; 3) Designate a responsible employee to coordinate efforts to comply with the law and notify all students and employees of that employee's name, address, and phone number; 4) Adopt and publish grievance procedures to resolve student and employee complaints; and 5) Disseminate the non-discrimination policy to students, employees, applicants for employment or admission, organizations holding collective bargaining or professional agreements with the institution and sources of reference of applicants for admission and employment. (Federal Register, 40:108, June 4, 1975)

[2]The Women's Educational Equity Act Program was established to support the development and dissemination of materials and model programs designed to assist efforts to achieve educational equity. Five school districts contracted with WEEAP to demonstrate these and other materials and programs.

[3]Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 provides resources for training and technical assistance in the areas of race desegregation, sex desegregation and national origin desegregation. The Title IV program supports Desegregation Assistance Centers (DACs) to provide a national system for assisting local school districts and Training Institutes (TIs) based in colleges and universities to provide intensive training. It provides resources to state education agencies and school districts who apply for funds.

References

Bornstein, R. Title IX compliance and sex equity: definitions, distinctions, costs, and benefits. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 1981).

Garcia, G.F. A study of compliance with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 in selected Iowa public school districts. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Drake University, 1979.

Hill, P.T., & Rettig, R. Mechanisms for the implementation of civil rights guarantees by educational institutions. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 1980. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 190 719).

House, E. The politics of educational innovation. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1974.

McCune, S., & Mathews, M. The administrator's role. Implementing Title IX and attaining sex equity: A workshop package for elementary-secondary educators. Washington, D.C.: Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education, Council of Chief State School Officers, 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 185 472).

Miller and Associates, Inc. The status of Title IX in Region X: An evaluation of models and barriers to implementation of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, for Region X of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Olympia, WA: 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 177 250).

Norton, N.L. Implementation of Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments in selected school districts of Alabama. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Auburn University, 1977.

Turetzky, J.A. Compliance with Title IX by Tennessee public schools during 1975-76. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, The University of Tennessee, 1979.

"Title IX action limited, Washington State ACLU says." Peer Perspective, 1978, 4(3), 1, 5.

"Viewpoint." Peer Perspective, 1978, 4 (3), 2.